MR. SPEAKER.—The question is:

"That leave be granted to introduce the Karnataka State Civil Services Bill, 1978."

*The motion was adopted and leave was granted.*

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sir, I beg to introduce the Karnataka State Civil Services Bill, 1978.

MR. SPEAKER.—The Bill is introduced.**

## Request to Suspend rules 133 and 322 and discuss Charges against a Minister.

SRI S. R BOMMAI.—I have given a motion under rule 322 of the Rules of Procedure to suspend a part of rule 133. and permit us to move a resolution I have given along with the motion under rule 322. The rule says:

"Any member may, with the consent of the Speaker, move that any rule may be suspended in its application to a particular motion before the Assembly and if the motion is carried the rule in question shall be suspended for the time being."

SRI B, V. KAKKILAYA.—The item on the Agenda is Bill for consideration regarding Karnataka Land Reforms Amendment Bil. The Hon. Minister for Revenue has moved for consideration and he has already spoken. I do not know when we are going tn continue discussion and when we are discussing it, whether any other subject should be allowed to be raised and whether discussion of this very important Bill should be helped up. I would like to have yous ruling.

SRI BHASKAR NAIDU.—I only request the Opposition Leader to read the rule.

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA.—Before he goes into that subject, I would like you to give a ruling with reference to this Bill, whether discussion on that is postponed to a future date or it is withheld.

MR SPEAKER.—The Karnataka Land Reforms (Amendment) Bill 1978 is there according to the Agenda for further discussion Yesterday it was moved and that has to be dissussied. Now the. Leader ofthe Opposition is trying to move a motion to suspend rule 133.

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA.—Any new subject he should have raised immediately after the question hour. Now. when we are discussing an important Bill. I want to know whether any new subject can be raised

**Bill appended as Annexure to this volume.

and discussion allowed on that. When lakhs of people are awaiting for this measure, I do not know whether it is appropriate to raise this subject now.

SRI H. T. KRISHNAPPA.—The point raised by Sri B. V. Kakkilya has to be upheld. The point is when we have taken up the Bill for consideration, at this stage are we proper and justified in switching over to some other subject ?

SRI K. BHASKAR NAIDU.—I would read the rule.

"Any member may, with the consent of the Speaker..."

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA.—I want to know whether you have postponed the consideration of the Bill. Please give a ruling on that.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—So far as the Land Reforms Bill is concerned, there is nothing to disagree. It is a very important Bill and I would assure my hon. friend that we are equally interested if not more, in passing the Bill and give benefits to the tenants. In fact I would like to move some progressive amendments. Here the resolution is about corruption charge against a minister.

HON. MEMBERS—No, no.

(Several hon, members stood up)

MR SPEAKER.—Please resume your seats.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I am speaking on the point of order raised. Let them have patience.

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA.—We want to know. Whether you have been permitted to move that subject at all.

SRI GOVINDA P. VADEYARAJ.—It is for the Chair to say.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—Sir, I am on my legs. I have not finished.

MR SPEAKER.—I am not permitting you to say preliminary matters in this regard.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI—I am speaking on the point of order raised by Sri B. V. Kakkilaya.

MR SPEAKER.—It should be strictly with reference to rule. Why did you say about the Minister ?

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Sir, I will confine myself to the Point of Order.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. member Sri Kakkilaya pointed out that as per the Agenda Bills for consideration and passing should be taken up, and the Bill to be discussed is very important. He asked me whether I have permitted Sri Bommai to raise the matter. I have not permitted him.

(Many Members from both sides stood up)

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Sir, a question has been raised that as per the Agenda the Land Reforms (Amendment) Bill is for discussion, and whether it is advisable for me and my friends who have signed the resolution, to raise this matter. It has been the convention of this House, and also the Parliament and other State Legislatures that when a motion is given under Rule 322 to permit the mover to make a preliminary statement. Even day-before-yesterdy, when a notice was give under Rule 146, you were kind enough to permit the Member to make a preliminary statement and the discussion was permitted for about 3 hours. I want to know why that right should be denied to me today? Why should the members on the other side object to it? I am very conscious that unless the Chair permits I cannot move the motion, But, I have a right to make a preliminary statement seeking permission of the Chair. Hon. member Sri Kakkilaya himself moved the motion the other day under Rule 146 and he spoke for about 45 minutes to seek permission to move the motion. Is there different yardsticks for members here?

SRI B.V. KAKKILAYA.—The hon. member is making a wrong statement.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—For Sri Kakkilaya summoning the Advocate General may be an important subject, and for me the corruption charges against a Minister is very important. Therefore, I am trying to convince the Chair.

SRI B. V. KAKKILAYA.—Sir, I am sorry, I have to protest against the remarks of the hon. member. I have openly said that I do not mind hanging the Vice Chancellor if he is corrupt. I am not here to protect anybody.

Sri S.R. BOMMAI.—Sir, please permit me to make a preliminary statement to convince the Chair to move the motion under Rule 322.

MR. SPEAKER.—I suggest that tomorrow after the Question Hour and after the matters under Rule 312 are over, the member may have a say. If he wants that Rule 322 should be suspended, I have to

examine the matter first before giving consent, Under Rule 133, fifteen clear days notice is necessary. It says:—

"A member other than a Minister who wishes to move a resolution shall give fifteen clear days' notice of his intention and shall, together with the notice submit the text of the resolution which he wishes to move."

Therefore let us go on with the Agenda. Let us see tomorrow whether the House is willing to suspend the Rule.

SRI J.H. PATEL.—Now, we could have easily agreed to your suggestion...

SRI S.M. SHEERNALY CHANDRASEKHAR.—Sir, I rise on a Point of Order. I have been seeking your permission right from the beginning.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon. member may please resume his seat.

SRI J.H. PATEL.—As has been properly explained, the Point of Order raised by Sri Kakkilaya is very relevant in the sense that the matter which the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has brought is not in the Agenda. That is all the objection that they have raised. They also say that they have no objection for taking up the matter when the Chair gives the consent and discuss it. For everything we go by rules. The Point of Order raised is that the subject is not in the Agenda and the point made by the Leader of the Opposition is that under Rule 133 we have to move a resolution. We are not saying that in order to get your consent to suspend this 15 days notice provision. We are trying to get your consent explaining why it is so important and why it is so urgent. Under Rule 322 there is a provision for suspension. Our submission to you is why the rule should be suspended. If you allow us to explain why it should be suspended and after our submission if you still come to the conclusion that you cannot suspend the rules, then we have no objec ion, we accept the ruling of the Chair. Now you please allow us to explain why the suspension of this rule is necessary. In order to explain that we have got to explain the contents of the resolution.

4-30 P.M.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS (Chief Minister).—It looks as if the Leader of the Opposition and other members of the opposition want to circumvent the entire rules of procedure and want to take this House in the manner in which they think and which suits to their convenience.

(Uproar in the House and nothing was audible)

I only request Sri Vadeyaraj to observe certain rules and regulations and also the decorum of the debates. If he wants to raise a point of order, let him raise it and say whatever I have said is parliamentary or un-Parliamentary. If I have made a wrong submission, then the Speaker can call me to order. I do not know why this young gentleman is getting so mush upset.

(There was uproar in the House)

ಶ್ರೀ ಮಳ್ಳೂರು ಆನಂದರಾವ್.—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನನ್ನದೊಂದು ಕ್ರಿಯಾಲೋಪವಿದೆ. ಏನೆಂದರೆ, ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ನಾವು ಏನಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಶುರು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಆ ಕಡೆಯವರು "ಹೋಽಽಽ" ಎಂದು ರೂಫ್ ಕಿತ್ತು ಹೋಗುವಂತೆ ಕಿರುಚುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದು ಸರಿಯೇ?

(Nothing was audible as some members were found protesting angrily)

MR. SPEAKER.—According to me there is no point of order.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—Sri B. V. Kakkilaya has correctly said that today's business is to consider the land Reforms (Amendment) Bill. 1978 and to continue the further discussion on the said Bill. In the me anwhile the Leader of the Opposition stood up to move a motion under rule 133 for which he wants the rule 133 which stipulates, the motion of a private member to be moved in a particular way atleast a minimum of 15 days notice shall have to be given. Now he wants to plead before the House that under rule 322 he wants the suspension of rule to take up a matter. Under Rule 322 there is provision to suspend the Rules. I have been given a copy of the notice sent. Now the Leader of the Opposition has to a preciate one point. As I know, he is also very anxious to maintain the dignity of the House and see that the business of the House is conducted smoothly in accordance with the Rules of Procedure. I do not know whether the Speaker has given consent to move his Motion. That is the point. Supposing if the Speaker in his judgement considered it necessary that permission could be given, certainly, I am not coming in the way. But you will have to fix a time as to when it could be taken up for consideration. Nothing is known to us. The Speaker is definite that consent is not given. In the absence of the Speaker,s consent, I only ask whether it is fair to take up this question at this jucture when the Bill has to be discussed. I would request the Hon. Leader of the Opposition to kindly consider this. What is the use by simply exciting and talking loudly on these things. This is not going to help anybody. Let him take your consent and then move if he wants.

And another important factor is that he has brought his Motion under Rule 133, which according him, deals with charges against a Minister. So, he wants to discuss this. Let him also consider very seriously, as to why he did not consider this under Rule 146. He is ignorant of the Rules.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—I know the rule and I will answer afterwards.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—For his ignorance of the matter I feel very sorry.

SRI S.R. BOMMAI.—Let the Chief Minister have restraint over his language.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—In perfect parliamentary language, I could say that the Member is exhibiting his ignorance. Rule 153 deals with Motion of No Confidence in Ministers and Statement by a Minister who has resigned etc.. Now the Motion they have sought to move under 133 clearly says that the Minister has to resign or I should dismiss him and all that, because of the charges. If there are charges they can straight away proceed under Rule 153. But in the absence of which they want to bring under Rule 133. They want to raise it abruptly without your concent. Again and again, I request them to consider whether they are right in suddenly raising this point and throwing the entire House into confusion and not allowing the House to proceed with the debate. I appeal not to obstruct the business of the House. If the Speaker allows it could be taken up either tomorrow or day after tomorrow. I don,t come in their way. You kinldy appoint time for it. If the House permits according to the Rule, we can proceed. Leaving that, abruptly raising is not correct and this is not fair also. He has the right to call and accuse anybody as he likes; but it should be according to the Rule. All those things should be in accordance with the Rules.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I very much appreciate the views expressed by the Chief Minister so far as the observance of the rules and business of the House are concerned. So far as the conventions that have been followed in this House and also in other Legislatures and Parliament, conventions will have to be taken into consideration which will have the force of rules. On a number of occasions, the motions admitted to be moved with the consent of the Speaker, you were good enough to permit Members to make preliminary statement seeking your permission. This is the convention followed in all the Houses of Legislature. The other day, Sir Kakkilaya moved a motion under Rule 146 which was not in the Agenda. It was not mentioned in the Agenda. Under Rule 146 consent is necessary. But you have permitted to make the preliminary statement and that debate in this House went on for four hours. Unfortunately, the Hon'ble Chief Minister was not here. I am extremely pained to say that the leader of the Houses, and the Chief Minister has forgotten the conventions that have been followed in the house. He is ignorant of the conventions that have been practiced and followed. With most respect, I submit that he has completely forgotten the conventions that have been

followed in the house. Statements have been permitted now and then Under every rule consent is necessary. But to get the consent, the members have to make prelimlnary statements without going into the merits. The Chief Mlnister has given an advice for which I am thankful to him. Under Rule 153 the Motion may be made subject to certain restrictions. According to it, it helps to movo a motion against the entire Cabinet. To-day my motion is only against an Hon'ble Minister. It is not a motion against the entrie Ministry. I do not think I can move a no-confidence motion at this hour. Therefore, this advice given to me by the Hon'ble Chief Minister is a very wrong advice.

This House has a convention of permitting a member to make a preliminary statement. Can we apply double standards ? Can the Chair be permitted to commit that error?

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I strongly object to any remark which reflects on the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER.—There is no double standard.

SRI D. DEVERAJ URS.—He has every right to ask for permission but he cannot question the discretion of the Speaker whether to give the consent to the particular motion or not. I do not know what transpired the other day. To call the Advocate-General the Speaker himself had the right; there was no need for a motion. Whether there was any need for it or not, I very much doubted. The Speaker may give his consent or he may with hold. There is no point in arguing : 'The other day you gave to X; to-day you moust give to Y and to-morrow you should give to Z'. Depending on each resolution the Speaker has discretion either to give consent or not.

MR. SPEAKER.—According to rules it will be examined.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—It has been the convention of this House whenever such a motion is brought under any rule, where the consent of the Speaker is necessary, to permit the members to make a preliminary statement to get the permission. Tnis has been followed throughout. It is the right of the member to make a preliminary seatement seeking consent. It is the discretion of the Chair either to give consent or refuse. But such preliminary statements have been allowed in this House on a number of occasions.

MR. SPEAKER.—This motion has been signed by several members and it has reached my hands only at 12-50 p.m. Mr. Wadeyaraj was also in my chamber. ನಾನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವುದು. ಅದನ್ನು ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಲ್ಲೇ ಕುಳಿತು ಹೇಳಿಬಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. I have to go through several references.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—To-morrow the matter may be permitted to be taken up after the questions to make a preliminary statement.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I have no objection for the Hon'ble Leader of the opposition to raise this point requesting the Chair to give his consent. Why he wants consent let him make a statement. You kindly fix up whether it is after question hour or at 5 P. M. or 3 P. M. It is left to you, Sir, to fix up the time. I don't mind if immediately after the question hour this has to be taken up.

SRI J. H. PATEL.—Technically the House can suspend the Rule.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—I am only requesting the Speaker to permit Mr. S R. Bommai, the Hon'ble Leader of the opposition to raise the issue requesting the house for giving permission. If permission is given, well and good, otherwise you cannot take it up. To-morrow he may raise it, we have no objection. It is for the Chair to fix the time. To-morrow the opposition Leader wants to say why he wants this motion to be moved and why suspension of the rule has to be made and why he is asking your consent. If you give your consent tomorrow, you may fix up the time.

SRI S. M. SHEERNALLI CHANDRASEKHAR.—Irequest you to expunge the statement made by the Hon'ble Leader of the opposition. He has levelled direct charge against the Minister.

MR. SPEAKER.—The hon'ble member will please resume his seat.

SRI. C. M. ARUMUGAM.—My only appeal is to follow the procedure as laid down under the Rules of procedure and Conduct of Business of this House. The Hon'ble Leader of the oppsition wanted suspension of the rule under Rule 322. While making this statement there was a lot of commotion or objection. I would like to know which rule he wants to be suspended?

MR. SPEAKER.—Clear notice of 15 days has to be given according to the Rule.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGAM.—He cannot move it under Rule 322 unless the subject-matter is here in the form of agenda. If you are going to allow them to raise the matter under Rule 322, then, you must put the subject matter in tomorrow's agenda. Are you going to put that resolution in tomorrow's agenda?

5-00 P. M.

MR. SPEAKER.—Unless I give my consent, how can I put it ?

SRI C. M. ARUMUGAM.—I have gone through the Rules of Practice and Procedure. The subject must be there in the agenda. Of course, you have got enough powers. I don't question you but you have to be guided under the four walls of the Rules of Practice and Procedure. If you suspend Rule No. 133, is that enough for me or anybody else to move the resolution? No you may kindly see Rule

No. 139. Rule No. 133 is contemplated on a certain background. Suppose a resolution is moved one days prior notice should be given for moving an amendment to the resolution. If the resolution is moved abruptly, then, you will be depriving the other hon'ble members to move amendments. I am only talking on the merit and the procedure and not on the facts of the case.

SRI D. DEVARAJ URS.—What I submitted is I would again just spell out one or two points so that the hon'ble member Mr. Arumughum will also appreciate. I merely stated that tomorrow, you may in your discretion, allow the Hon'ble Leader of the opposition to make his his submission as to why he wants this suspension of the rule. That is all and to suspend it or not is left to the house. Just to say why he wants the suspension, you should give the consent to that also. That is what he is submitting as I understand. I only stated that left to myself, I have no objection for him to make that statement What is to be done next is another point. All these issues could be raised at the time of his raising the motion as to why that suspension should be there or not.

SRI C. M. ARUMUGAM.—In support of my argument, I would like to quote from May's Parliamentary Practice and Procedure if says as follows.—

> "Motion for suspension of a rule and its application to the particular motion may be moved only when that motion is before the house *i.e.*, if it is included in the list of business."

I think I have made my position very clear. Therefere, there is no point in postponing it to tomorrow. To-day, it is not in the agenda; tomorrow also it will not be in the agenda. In all fairness, I suggest the Chair to take a decision on that issue also, because tomorrow also the Resolution under Rule 133 will not find a place in the agenda. If it is not there, then, suspending the rule does not arise. But suspending the rule is not the power of the Hon'ble Speaker. It is the power vested with the House. If the Hon'ble Speaker says that it is there in the agenda of tomorrow, I have nothing to say.

SRI S. R. BOMMAI.—I don't want to elaborate my arguments now. So far as making a submiss on on a subject or a motion which is not in the agenda, I would quote hundreds of instance tomorrow and show to my hon. Friend where preliminary statement has been permitted when there is no subject on the agenda. Tomorrow, I will elaborate it and if my hon. Friend is convinced let him support.

SRI H. GANGADHARAN.—The Hon'ble Speaker can suspend even Rule No. 133 and permit the hon'ble member to move the Resolution.

## KARNATAKA LAND REFORMS (AMENDMENT) BILL, 1978.

*Motion to Consider (Debate Continued.)*

SRI T.R. SHAMANNA (Basavanagudi).—Sir, Under Rules of Practice and Procedure, I have given a notice of amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಮೊದಲು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಮಾಡಿ. ಆಮೇಲೆ ತಾವು ಮಾತನಾಡಿ.

SRI T.R. SHAMANNA —Sir, under Rule 73, after the Member incharge of the Bill moves that the Bill be taken into consideration, any member may move as an amendment that the Bill be circulated for the purpose of eliciting opinion thereon. Therefore, if my amendment is accepted, it is quite possible that there may not be any discussion at this stage.

ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರು.—ಪರ್ಯಾಲೋಚನಾ ಸೂಚನೆ ಮತ್ತು ಚರ್ಚೆ ಎರಡೂ ಜೊತೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಲಿ.

[MADAM DEPUTY SPEAKER (SMT. SUMATHI B. MADIMAN) in the Chair]

† ಶ್ರೀ ಟಿ.ಆರ್. ಶಾಮಣ್ಣ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಭಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆ ಅತೀ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದುದ್ದು ಎಂದು ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನಾ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಕ್ರೋಢೀಕರಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಹಿಂದೆ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣಾ ಕಾಯಿದೆಯನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾಗ ಏನೇನು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳಿದ್ದವೋ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಕಡಿಮೆ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಅಂದರೆ ಸುಮಾರು ೪೦ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಈಗ ನಮ್ಮ ಮುಂದೆ ಇಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಸೂದೆ ಅನೇಕ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಒಳಗೊಂಡಿದೆ. ಈ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಿಂದ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರಿಗೆ ಹಿತರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಅಥವಾ ತೊಂದರೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ನಾವು ಯೋಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಚರ್ಚೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಇಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಅನೇಕ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ, ಒಂದು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೆಗಳು ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಆ ಜಮೀನಿನಲ್ಲಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ಟೆನೆಂಟ್‌ಗೆ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ಯಾರು ಇರುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರಿಗೇ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾರ್ಟಿಗೇಜ್ ಅಥವಾ ಆಧಾರಭೋಗ್ಯ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಭೂಸುಧಾರಣೆಯಿಂದ ಯಾರಿಗಾದರೂ ಆಡ್ಡಿ ಅಡಚಣೆಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ, ಅಥವಾ ಅವರದೇನಾದರೂ ಕ್ಲೈಮ್ಸ್ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದಂಥ ಕಾಲಮಿತಿಯೊಳಗೆ ಅಂದರೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ ಪಾಸ್ ಆದ ಮೂರು ತಿಂಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಇದರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಆಪ್ಲಿಕೇಷನ್ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಇದೆ. ಇನ್ನು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಅರ್ಜಿಗಳು ಬರಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ಅಂಶ ಸಹ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಬೇರೆ ಬೇರೆ ಫೈನಾನ್‌ಷಿಯಲ್ ಇನ್‌ಸ್ಟಿಟ್ಯೂಷನ್ಸ್ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ವಿಚಾರಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಮೆಂಬರ್ ಮೂರು ಸಾವಿರಂತ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಸಬೆಗೆ ಬರದೆ ತಪ್ಪಿಸಿಕೊಂಡರೆ ಅವರನ್ನು ಹೆಗೆಯತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಡೆಪ್ಯೂಟಿ ಕಮಿಷನರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದೆ. ಒಂದು ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯುನಲ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಕೇಸುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಕಾರಣವಿದ್ದರೆ ಮತ್ತೊಂದು ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯುನಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಕಳಿಸಬಹುದು ಎನ್ನುವ ವಿಚಾರ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಯಾವುದೇ ಕೇಸನ್ನು ತೀರ್ಮಾನ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಟ್ರಿಬ್ಯುನಲಿಗೆ ಏನಾದರೂ ತೊಂದರೆಗಳಿದ್ದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ರಿವೋಕ್ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕರು ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಮಾಹಿತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಗ್ರಹಿಸಿ, ತಮಗೆ ಅನು